

1 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

2 **COMMISSIONERS**

3 MARC SPITZER, Chairman
4 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
5 JEFF HATCH-MILLER
6 MIKE GLEASON
7 KRISTIN K. MAYES

8 In the matter of)	
9 FOUNTAIN CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LLC)	DOCKET NO. S-03505A-04-0000
10 c/o DAVID A. FAZIO)	
11 3616 West Cortez)	DECISION NO. <u>67218</u>
12 Phoenix, Arizona 85029)	
13)	
14 INTEGROWTH FINANCIAL GROUP)	ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST,
15 C/O ROGER ALVIN SANDE)	ORDER OF RESTITUTION, ORDER
16 CDC # V06974)	FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES
17 P.O. Box 2210)	AGAINST RESPONDENTS DONALD
18 Susanville, California 96130)	AND HELEN ABERNATHY
19)	
20 RICHARD A. FANDRICH)	
21 11424 North 25th Avenue)	
22 Phoenix, Arizona 85029)	
23)	
24 DAVID A. and DEBORAH FAZIO)	
25 3616 West Cortez)	
26 Phoenix, Arizona 85029)	
)	
DONALD and HELEN ABERNATHY)	
2323 North Central Avenue, #803)	
Phoenix, Arizona, 85004)	
)	
STEPHEN A. and JANE DOE HILTBRAND)	
2156 E. Estrella Circle)	
Mesa, Arizona 85202)	
)	
ROGER ALVIN SANDE)	
CDC # V06974)	
P.O. Box 2210)	
Susanville, California 96130)	
)	
Respondents.)	

25 On May 7, 2004, the Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation
26 Commission ("Commission") filed a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing Regarding Proposed Order

1 To Cease and Desist, Order for Restitution, for Administrative Penalties and for Other Affirmative
2 Relief ("Notice") with respect to Respondents DONALD AND HELEN ABERNATHY ("the
3 ABERNATHYS"). The Division served the Notice on the ABERNATHYS via certified mail, return
4 receipt requested on July 6, 2004. The Notice specified that the ABERNATHYS would be afforded
5 an opportunity for an administrative hearing regarding this matter upon filing a written request with
6 Docket Control of the Commission within ten days of receipt of the Notice. The ABERNATHYS
7 failed to request a hearing within the required time.

8
9 **L**

10 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

11 1. DONALD ABERNATHY ("ABERNATHY"), a married man, was served at
12 3237A East Sunshine St., #122, Springfield, Missouri 65804.

13 2. HELEN ABERNATHY was at all relevant times the spouse of RESPONDENT
14 DONALD ABDERNATHY. She was served at 2323 N. Central Av., #803, Phoenix, Arizona
15 85004. HELEN ABERNATHY is joined in this action under A.R.S. § 44-2031(C) solely for
16 purposes of determining the liability of the marital community.

17 3. At all times relevant, ABERNATHY was a resident of the state of Arizona. He was
18 not registered with the Division as a broker or a securities salesman.

19 4. In 1999, RESPONDENTS INTEGROWTH FINANCIAL GROUP
20 ("INTEGROWTH") and ROGER ALVIN SANDE ("SANDE") recruited RESPONDENTS
21 RICHARD A. FANDRICH ("FANDRICH"), ABERNATHY, DAVID A. FAZIO ("FAZIO") and
22 STEPHEN A. HILTBRAND ("HILTBRAND") (collectively "the INDIVIDUAL
23 RESPONDENTS") to start a branch office of INTEGROWTH in Phoenix. SANDE told the
24 INDIVIDUAL RESPONDENTS that INTEGROWTH was his company. The purpose of the
25 company was to sell viatical and other investment opportunities to members of the public in
26 Arizona. SANDE told the INDIVIDUAL RESPONDENTS that INTEGROWTH marketed

1 viatical policies. SANDE agreed with the INDIVIDUAL RESPONDENTS that INTEGROWTH
2 would pay all expenses incurred in the sale of the viaticals and would pay the INDIVIDUAL
3 RESPONDENTS a 7% commission on each viatical policy they sold.

4 5. In June 1999, the INDIVIDUAL RESPONDENTS formed FOUNTAIN CAPITAL
5 MANAGEMENT, LLC ("FCM"), and continued their operations under its name. The
6 INDIVIDUAL RESPONDENTS and FCM (collectively the "FCM RESPONDENTS") continued
7 to sell viatical policies, just as they had with INTEGROWTH. INTEGROWTH and SANDE
8 continued to receive an override commission on all products sold by the FCM RESPONDENTS.

9 6. The FCM RESPONDENTS agreed that they would share all commissions among
10 themselves, without regard to which of them made the actual sale.

11 7. Both INTEGROWTH and FCM ran advertisements in Phoenix newspapers,
12 offering investments with returns as high as 40%. Once investors called, INTEGROWTH,
13 SANDE and the FCM RESPONDENTS (collectively "RESPONDENTS") attempted to sell them
14 the investments.

15 **The Viatical Policies**

16 8. From at least January 1999 through at least June 2000, RESPONDENTS offered and
17 sold securities in the form of viatical settlement contracts and investment contracts to Arizona
18 investors. A viatical settlement contract involves the purchase of an interest in the proceeds from a
19 life insurance policy of a terminally ill individual. Various viatical companies purchase the
20 policies at a discount and re-sell the benefits to investors at less than the full face value. When the
21 policy matures, that is when the insured dies, the investor receives the full face value as return of
22 investment plus profit.

24 9. All viatical policies sold by RESPONDENTS were on behalf of Future First
25 Financial Group ("Future First") of Pointe Verda Beach, Florida. RESPONDENTS told investors
26 that the only risk involved with the purchase of viatical policies was the risk that the insured would

1 die at a later date, thereby reducing the expected return. They informed investors that returns could
2 be as high as 100%, with the investment being safe and guaranteed.

3 10. Investors did not receive medical information on the insured whose policy they
4 purchased. Rather, they received a short summary from a medical doctor, simply describing the
5 life expectancy of the insured. RESPONDENTS never checked and thus did not inform investors
6 that the doctor who wrote the medical summary was a Florida cosmetic doctor. Investors were
7 told that Future First viatical policies were 100% correct in their medical assessments with no
8 insured living past their expected date of death.

9 11. Investors were also informed that they would never have to pay any fees or other
10 payments after they purchased the viatical policy.

11 12. On or about February 4, 2000, Future First and its vice-president were indicted by
12 the state of Florida for 81 counts of grand theft and one count of organized fraud in connection
13 with the marketing of fraudulently obtained policies valued at \$6,900,000. After Future First
14 defaulted on its management responsibilities with respect to the viatical policies, investors were left
15 with the choice of making additional payments to keep the policies in effect or allowing policies to
16 lapse due to nonpayment of premiums. Some Future First viatical policies were found not to have
17 actual underlying insurance policies.

18 13. RESPONDENTS failed to provide full disclosure regarding the investment
19 including risk, disclosure statements, prospectuses, financial statements or RESPONDENTS' own
20 lack of due diligence in investigating the investment. RESPONDENTS failed to provide certain
21 material information to investors about Future First, including but not limited to past operations,
22 balance sheets, statements of income, retained earnings, and cash flows that would reflect the
23 financial position of these entities. RESPONDENTS distributed literature that misrepresented the
24 investment as a "no risk" opportunity. RESPONDENTS failed to provide investors with certain
25
26

1 material information about the use of investor proceeds, such as the cost to purchase the policy, the
2 fees and commissions payable to them, medical advisors, or any other participants in the program.

3 14. From January 1999 through at least June 2000, RESPONDENTS offered and sold
4 securities in the form of viatical settlement contracts and investment contracts to at least 34
5 Arizona investors, who invested a total of at least \$1,110,482.

6 **The Alpha Pay Telephone Contracts**

7 15. Alpha Telcom, Inc. ("Alpha") was an Oregon corporation located at 2751 Highland
8 Avenue, Grants Pass, Oregon 97526.

9 16. American Telecommunications Company, Inc. ("ATC") was a Nevada corporation
10 formed as a wholly owned subsidiary of Alpha on or about September 17, 1998. Originally named
11 ATC, Inc., the name was changed to American Telecommunications Company, Inc., sometime in
12 the first half of 2000. Its address was the same as Alpha's, but was later changed to 620 S.W. 4th
13 Street, Grants Pass, Oregon 97526, then to 2900 Vine Street, Suite J, Grants Pass, Oregon 97526,
14 and then to 942 S.W. 6th Street, Suite G, Grants Pass, Oregon 97526.

15 17. Paul S. Rubera ("Rubera") was the president and control person of Alpha, and the
16 control person of ATC.

17 18. ATC was organized by Rubera and operated in conjunction with and as an alter ego
18 of Alpha. The two companies were controlled by Rubera and his associates.

19 19. Alpha and ATC, and their affiliates, sold pay telephones with telephone service
20 agreements pursuant to which the investor would share in the profits of the pay telephone.
21 Investors would enter into two agreements, a purchase agreement, and a service agreement with
22 Alpha to manage the phone. The two agreements were presented and promoted simultaneously.
23 The telephones were presented to potential investors with four options in the way of service
24 contracts, each varying in the amount of service provided. The four options varied from Level 1,
25
26

1 which included a minimum of service, to Level 4, which provided full service to the purchaser,
2 including choosing a site and installing the telephone, collecting all revenue from the telephone's
3 operation, repairing the telephone when necessary, and even repurchasing or buying back the
4 telephone at the investor's option. Under Level 4, Alpha would split the net proceeds with the
5 investor on a 70/30 basis, with Alpha retaining 70% and the investor receiving 30%. The price of
6 the pay telephones was the same regardless of the service option chosen, \$5,000.00 per telephone.
7 Although investors were given a choice of using a company other than Alpha to manage the phone,
8 no known Arizona investor picked a company other than Alpha to manage their phones. A "typical
9 return" on each pay telephone was touted as 14% per year. In practice, all purchasers received
10 \$58.34 per month per pay telephone purchased, which amounted to exactly 14% per annum.
11

12 20. ATC's primary role was marketing the contracts. Alpha's main focus was on
13 obtaining phone sites and installing, servicing, and managing the phones.

14 21. ATC was presented to the public as the sales organization for Alpha. In early 1999,
15 ATC engaged Strategic Partnership Alliance, L.L.C., a Nevada limited liability company, and/or
16 SPA Marketing, L.L.C., a Nevada limited liability corporation, (collectively "SPA") as its
17 independent marketing and sales firm(s). SPA thereafter was responsible for hiring, training, and
18 supervising sales agents who were selling the telephone contracts. After SPA came on board, ATC
19 remained as the processing center for the contracts, while Alpha continued to perform the service
20 and maintenance of the phones.
21

22 22. The FCM RESPONDENTS, directly or indirectly, entered into agreements with
23 Alpha, ATC, and/or SPA, pursuant to which the FCM RESPONDENTS sold investment contracts
24 involving Alpha pay telephones (the "Alpha investment contracts") within or from the state of
25 Arizona. All Alpha investment contracts the FCM RESPONDENTS sold were Level 4 contracts.
26

1 23. The FCM RESPONDENTS told prospective investors their investments were
2 insured. The insurers' name varied. Mentioned most often was the Northern and Western
3 Insurance Company of Grand Turk, Turks and Caicos Islands, British West Indies ("N&W"). Also
4 mentioned were Lloyd's of London and four other insurance companies listed as re-insurers.
5 N&W was a captive insurance company wholly owned by Paul S. Rubera, the President and
6 control person of Alpha, and Robert S. Harrison of Richmond, Texas. N&W is not authorized to
7 write insurance in Arizona. On information and belief, N&W was not authorized to write
8 insurance in any state in which the Alpha pay telephones were located. In a letter dated August 15,
9 2001, Harrison stated: "There is not now, nor was there ever any insurance coverage for Alpha
10 Telcom, Inc."

11 24. The FCM RESPONDENTS presented Alpha to prospective customers as a stable,
12 profitable, and innovative company that had been in business since 1985. Alpha was said to be
13 selling and providing a "turn-key" operation.
14

15 25. On information and belief, sales agents were paid commissions from 12% to 19%
16 per telephone sold.

17 26. Alpha has a long regulatory history in which state securities regulators have found that
18 these purchases of pay telephones and accompanying service contracts were unregistered securities in
19 the form of investment contracts that were sold by unregistered persons and/or entities, and ordered
20 Alpha and those working with it to cease and desist. The FCM RESPONDENTS did not reveal these
21 orders to the investors with whom they dealt. The orders that the FCM RESPONDENTS could have
22 revealed include:
23

24 a. February 2, 1999, Cease and Desist Order issued by Pennsylvania Securities
25 Commission in *In the Matter of Alpha Telcom, Inc., et al.*, No. 9812-06.
26

1 b. November 17, 1999, Cease and Desist Order issued by North Carolina Secretary
of State in *In the Matter of the North Carolina Securities Division v. ATC, Inc., Paul*
2 *Rubera, et al.*, No. 99-038-CC.

3 c. June 30, 1999, Temporary Order of Prohibition issued by Illinois Secretary of
State in *In the Matter of Alpha Telcom, Inc.*, No. 9900201.

4 d. January 14, 2000, Consent Order of Prohibition issued by Illinois Secretary of
State in *In the Matter of Alpha Telcom, Inc.*, No. 9900201, Alpha agreeing to offer
5 rescission to all Illinois purchasers.

6 e. November 24, 1999, Cease and Desist Order issued by Wisconsin Department
of Financial Institutions in *In the Matter of Alpha Telcom, Inc. and Paul S. Rubera, et al.*,
7 No. S-99225(EX).

8 f. March 7, 2000, Temporary Cease and Desist Ordered issued by Rhode Island
Department of Business Regulation in *In the Matter of Alpha Telcom, Inc. and ATC, Inc.*

9 g. July 18, 2000, Florida Department of Banking and Finance filed administrative
10 action against Alpha and others, seeking a Cease and Desist Order.

11 h. October 24, 2000, Desist and Refrain Order issued by California Department of
Corporations.

12 37. The United States Securities and Exchange Commission sued Alpha and its
13 affiliates in *SEC v. Alpha Telcom, Inc., et al.*, No. CV01-1283 PA. The court entered a temporary
14 restraining order on August 27, 2001 and a preliminary injunction on September 6, 2001. The SEC
15 alleged that Alpha and its affiliates engaged in a Ponzi-like scheme that never generated enough
16 income to pay expenses, and that the money paid to existing investors always came from sales to
17 new investors. A court-appointed receiver subsequently took over the remaining operations of
18 Alpha. Alpha consented on October 19, 2001 to entry of the Final Judgment of Permanent
19 Injunction against it, but did not admit the allegations of the Complaint.

20 38. Alpha's monthly payments to investors ceased prior to August, 2001.

21 39. The FCM RESPONDENTS sold Alpha investment contracts involving telephones to
22 at least 9 individuals or entities within or from the state of Arizona from September 2000 through July,
23 2001, for a total sales amount of at least \$250,000.

Chemical Trust Investment Contract

1
2 40. Beginning 1999, RESPONDENTS began offering the Chemical Trust investment.
3 Investors were told that Chemical Trust was a "Members Only Investment Trust" located in West
4 Palm Beach, Florida. Agents, such as RESPONDENTS, were instructed to market the investment
5 to investors at a minimum of \$10,000 per contract for 12 months or more. RESPONDENTS were
6 given authority to offer as much as 25% interest for each investment. Of that 25%,
7 RESPONDENTS were able to choose how much to offer to investors as interest and how much they
8 would keep for their commissions for selling the investment.

9 41. Investors were told that the investments are guaranteed two ways. First, the
10 investments are guaranteed by Chemical Trust which allegedly held \$450,000,000 in assets.
11 Second, the investments were guaranteed by a surety payment bond totaling "in excess of \$6
12 billion dollars" that was provided "for 100% of their principal amount invested" at no cost to the
13 investor. The surety payment bond was allegedly provided by U. S. Guarantee Corporation
14 located in Phoenix, Arizona. In fact, U. S. Guarantee Corporation is not licensed in Arizona as a
15 surety insurer. USGC allegedly had assets of \$2,415,142,120, which backed up the bond
16 guaranteeing the investment. Those funds turned out not to exist.

17
18 42. RESPONDENTS informed investors that Chemical Trust had been in business for
19 14 years. Chemical Trust allegedly made profits by purchasing U.S. Treasury notes and
20 distressed property at discount, selling for an immediate profit.

21
22 43. On January 7, 2000, the SEC filed a complaint against Chemical Trust, USGC,
23 and others alleging that the money invested with them was misappropriated and sent to offshore
24 bank accounts. It also alleged that Chemical Trust represented to investors that their funds would
25 be used to purchase U.S. Treasury notes and distressed properties, and the investment was 100
26 percent guaranteed through the security bond with U.S. Guarantee. According to the SEC's

1 complaint, Chemical had not purchased any U.S. Treasury notes or distressed properties, and
2 investor funds were not secured. The complaint alleges that, in a classic Ponzi scheme fashion,
3 Chemical Trust used new investor funds to pay interest to existing investors, in a Ponzi scheme.
4 Subsequently, a preliminary injunction and final judgment was issued against the defendants and
5 a receiver appointed to attempt to collect assets.

6 44. On June 30, 2000, the ACC entered an Order against Chemical Trust and others,
7 finding that they violated the Arizona Securities Act. *See In re Alliance Trust, at al.*, DOCKET
8 NO. S-03363A-99-0000.

9 45. RESPONDENTS sold at least \$856,042 of investments in Chemical Trust to at
10 least 20 investors.

11 **The ATM Program**

12 46. The FCM RESPONDENTS sold investments in automatic teller machines
13 (“ATMs”) to the public through Integrated Cash Systems (“ICS”). Pursuant to the service
14 contracts promoted with the ATMs, the service companies would manage the equipment for the
15 purpose of generating a profit for investors. The offering documents for the investments stated that
16 the ATMs were allegedly placed with retail merchants in order to enable electronic purchase
17 transactions at the customers’ points of delivery. The services offered include locating and
18 installing the equipment with retail merchants, handling or processing the transactions, monitoring
19 and maintaining the equipment, insuring the equipment, and issuing monthly profit distribution
20 checks to the investors or “business owners.”
21

22 47. Although the offering documents for the ATMs describe options for different levels
23 of managing the equipment, in practice, all investors selected the full-service option, which offered
24 a revenue-sharing feature and a buy-back provision from the recommended service company. Under
25 the full-service option, investors had no responsibilities with respect to the operation of their
26

1 equipment beyond signing the service contracts, no financial obligations apart from the initial
2 payment to purchase the units, no continuing financial obligation in the operation of their
3 equipment, and no liability for any expenses or costs related to the operation of the equipment. At
4 least one of the services offered to investors, i.e., transaction handling, requires special expertise.
5 That function involves processing transactions, and is the key to generating a profit for investors.

6 48. The FCM RESPONDENTS sold the ATMs to investors who had no experience in or
7 knowledge of the cash terminal business, who never intended to take possession of, or to manage, the
8 equipment, and who did not even know where their equipment was located.

9
10 49. According to written materials and oral statements made to investors, investors in
11 the ATM programs are supposed to receive a) minimum monthly revenue equivalent to 12% of
12 their original investment generated from the operation of their equipment; b) a share of the monthly
13 net profit on each machine in excess of the base monthly payment; c) a full return of their
14 investment at the end of the five-year term because they have a right to sell the equipment back to
15 the service company for the original amount of the investment, or renew the investment; and d) if
16 the monthly revenue from the operation of the machine falls below the base payment, the right to
17 request that the service company repurchase the equipment for the original sales price or relocate
18 the equipment to another location with the potential for a higher profit from sharing in increased
19 revenue.
20

21 50. Despite these representations, ICS defaulted on payments and failed to repurchase
22 the investors' ATM machines as requested. The FCM RESPONDENTS sold at ATM investments
23 to at least four investors who invested at least \$88,000.
24
25
26

The Other Securities Orders

51. In 1996, the Missouri Commissioner of Securities issued an order against ABERNATHY for violation of its securities laws.

52. On September 28, 1999, the Iowa Securities Bureau issued an order against INTEGROWTH and ABERNATHY for violation of its securities laws for their sale of the Chemical Trust products.

53. On August 24, 1999, the North Dakota Commissioner of Securities issued an order against INTEGROWTH and HILTBRAND for violations of its securities laws.

54. On October 29, 2001, SANDE was arrested on 38 felony counts of theft and unlicensed sales of viaticals, allegedly defrauding investors of over \$2.7 million. On November 19, 2003, SANDE was sentenced to seven years and four months in prison, in addition to paying \$1,453,929.56 in restitution.

55. On November 11, 2003, the Wisconsin Department issued an order for fraud in the sale of securities against FCM, ABERNATHY, FAZIO and FANDRICH.

56. RESPONDENTS did not inform any investors of any of the Orders against them, nor of any of the Orders against the companies whose investments they sold.

II.**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and the Securities Act.

2. ABERNATHY offered or sold securities within or from Arizona, within the meaning of A.R.S. §§ 44-1801(15), 44-1801(21), and 44-1801(26).

3. ABERNATHY violated A.R.S. § 44-1841 by offering or selling securities that were neither registered nor exempt from registration.

7 6. ABERNATHY directly or indirectly controlled FCM within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-
8 1999. Therefore, he is liable to the same extent as FCM for its violations of A.R.S. § 44-1991.

8. ABERNATHY's conduct is grounds for an order of restitution pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032.

13 9. ABERNATHY's conduct is grounds for administrative penalties under A.R.S. § 44-
14 2036.

ORDER

17 THEREFORE, on the basis of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, the Commission
18 finds that the following relief is appropriate, in the public interest, and necessary for the protection
19 of investors:

IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032, that ABERNATHY, his agents, employees, successors and assigns, permanently cease and desist from violating the Securities Act.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032, that ABERNATHY and HELEN ABERNATHY shall, jointly and severally, pay restitution to investors shown on the records of the Commission in the amount of \$2,304,524, plus interest at the rate of 10% per annum from the date of each investment until paid in full. ABERNATHY and HELEN ABERNATHY shall be entitled to setoffs for restitution paid to investors and verified by the Director of Securities.

1 Payment shall be made by cashier’s check or money order payable to the “State of Arizona” to be
2 placed in an interest-bearing account maintained and controlled by the Arizona Attorney General.
3 The Arizona Attorney General shall disburse the funds on a pro rata basis to investors. If all
4 investors are paid in full, any excess funds shall revert to the state of Arizona. If ABERNATHY
5 and HELEN ABERNATHY do not comply with this order of restitution, any outstanding balance
6 shall be in default and shall be immediately due and payable without notice or demand.

7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2036, that ABERNATHY and
8 HELEN ABERNATHY shall, jointly and severally, pay an administrative penalty in the amount of
9 \$25,000, payable to the “State of Arizona.” Payment shall be made in full by cashier’s check or
10 money order on the date of this Order. If ABERNATHY and HELEN ABERNATHY do not

11 ..
12 ..
13 ..
14 ..
15 ..
16 ..
17 ..
18 ..
19 ..
20 ..
21 ..
22 ..
23 ..
24 ..
25 ..
26 ..

1 comply with this order for administrative penalties, any outstanding balance may be deemed in
2 default and shall be immediately due and payable without notice or demand.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order shall become effective immediately.

4 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

5
6 /s/ Marc Spitzer William A. Mundell Jeffrey Hatch-Miller
7 CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER

8
9 Lowell Gleason Kristin Mayes
COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER

10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL,
11 Executive Secretary of the Arizona Corporation
12 Commission, have hereunto set my hand and caused the
13 official seal of the Commission to be affixed at the
14 Capitol, in the City of Phoenix, this 24th day of
August, 2004

15 /s/ Brian C. McNeil
16 BRIAN C. McNEIL
17 Executive Secretary

18 _____
19 DISSENT

20
21 _____
22 DISSENT

23
24 This document is available in alternative formats by contacting Yvonne L. McFarlin, Executive
25 Assistant to the Executive Secretary, voice phone number 602-542-3931, E-mail
ymcfarlin@cc.state.az.us.

26 (md)